

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/056,971	01/25/2002	Larry Blake	TEKIA.004A	3885
20995	7590 01/14/2004		EXAMINER	
	MARTENS OLSON &	WILLSE, DAVID H		
2040 MAIN FOURTEEN	-		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
IRVINE, CA	A 92614		3738	
			DATE MAILED: 01/14/2004	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		10/056,971	BLAKE ET AL.
Office Action Sumn	nary	Examiner	Art Unit
		Dave Willse	3738
Th MAILING DATE of this Period for Reply	communication ap _l	pears on the cov r sheet with the	correspondence address
 If NO period for reply is specified above, the r 	DMMUNICATION. Be provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 If this communication. In thirty (30) days, a repleaximum statutory periodication In the first of the mailing	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be till by within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDON	mely filed ys will be considered timely. n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1) Responsive to communicati	on(s) filed on <u>03 /</u>	lovember 2003.	
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.	2b)∐ This	action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in c closed in accordance with the		nce except for formal matters, pr Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	
Disposition of Claims	,		
4)	is/are withdra ed. ed. ted to.	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers			
Replacement drawing sheet(s)	is/are: a) ☐ acc any objection to the including the correct ojected to by the E	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is of	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 12) Acknowledgment is made of		n priority under 35 H.S.C. & 1190	a)-(d) or (f)
a) All b) Some * c) N 1. Certified copies of the 2. Certified copies of the 3. Copies of the certified application from the I * See the attached detailed Of 13) Acknowledgment is made of since a specific reference was 37 CFR 1.78. a) The translation of the fo	lone of: e priority documen e priority documen d copies of the prio nternational Burea fice action for a list a claim for domest s included in the fil preign language pr a claim for domest	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applica prity documents have been receive tu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). t of the certified copies not receive tic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 rst sentence of the specification co	tion No red in this National Stage red. (e) (to a provisional application) or in an Application Data Sheet. ceived. 0 and/or 121 since a specific
Attachment(s)			
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PT 		5) D Notice of Informal	y (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)

The Applicant's remarks in regard to the extension fees have been reviewed. The examiner does not believe that the Response received on August 1, 2003, can be considered a "bona fide attempt", especially since the Applicant was alerted to the very same type of deficiency in the Office Letter mailed on July 16, 2003. However, if the Applicant wishes to pursue the matter, it is recommended that the Applicant file a separate paper entitled "Letter to the Group Director" with an explanation of the situation.

The following is, in part, necessary in order to correct errors made in the Office action mailed on April 7, 2003. In particular, claims 1 and 39, both of which are directed to an intraocular lens, will be withdrawn from examination if the Applicant again elects (method) Invention III, regardless of the species elected. Also, claim 129 is drawn to a method rather than to a haptic. (In view of the circumstances, the Applicant is permitted to elect an invention and a species different from that elected during the telephone conversation on March 13, 2003, if desired.)

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-74, 220, and 221 drawn to an intraocular lens, classified in class 623, subclass 6.46.
- II. Claims 105-128 and 148-219, drawn to a haptic for an intraocular lens, classified in class 623, subclass 4.1.
- III. Claims 75-104, drawn to a method for introducing an intraocular lens into an eye, classified in class 606, subclass 107.
- IV. Claims 129-147, drawn to a method of inserting a haptic into an eye, classified in class 623, subclass 6.12.

Inventions I and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, product as claimed can be used in a materially different process. For example, instead of the separate insertion steps of the method, the IOL as claimed can be pre-assembled (the optic and haptic already being attached to one another) and then rolled up into an insertion tube for implantation.

Inventions II and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process such as rolling the overall haptic rather than bending or flexing the arms onto or next to or over or toward each other.

Inventions I and II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the combination does not require the interior angle range (claim 105), the specific type of flexibility (claim 148), or the alignment of V-shaped elements (claim 172 or

196). The subcombination has separate utility such as supporting a capsular bag and/or preventing cell migration along the capsular bag and/or holding microelectronic components or drug delivery implants or devices other than optics.

Inventions III and IV are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the combination does not require the bending or flexing step. The subcombination has separate utility such as inserting the haptic for the alternative uses identified above.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and divergent required searches, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Application/Control Number: 10/056,971

Art Unit: 3738

In the event that Invention I or Invention III is elected, the following further requirement is made:

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Page 5

Species I: Figure 2;

Species II: Figure 3A;

Species III: Figure 3B;

Species IV: Figure 3C.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species (MPEP § 809.02(a)).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to

Application/Control Number: 10/056,971

Art Unit: 3738

Page 6

be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

In the event that Invention Π or Invention IV is elected, the following further requirement is made:

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Haptic Cleat

Species Ia:

Figure 3D;

Species Ib:

Figure 3E;

Species Ic:

Figure 3F.

Haptic Form

Species IIa:

Figures 2, 5, and 13A-13C;

Species IIb:

Figure 4;

Species IIc:

Figure 6;

Species IId:

Figures 15A and 16C;

Species IIe:

Figure 15B;

Species IIf:

Figure 15C;

Species IIg:

Figure 16B.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, one each from the above two groupings, for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species (MPEP § 809.02(a)).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other inventions.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dave Willse whose telephone number is (703) 308-2903. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday and often on Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott, can be reached on (703) 308-2111. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.

Dave Willse

Primary Examiner Art Unit 3738